



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,250	07/31/2003	Charles Hymes	47524/P157/10613152	4797
29053 7590 02/20/2009 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 2200 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201-2784				
EXAMINER AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2179				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/20/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/633,250  
Filing Date: July 31, 2003  
Appellant(s): HYMES ET AL.

---

R. Ross Viguet  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11/24/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 6/25/2008.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

2007/0118504	SUBRAMANIAM	5-2007
7,080,327	BARTZ	7-2006

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam (US 2007/0118504 A1), herein referred to as "Subramaniam" in view of Bartz et al (US 7,080,327 B1), herein referred to as "Bartz".

As for independent claim 1, Subramaniam teaches a graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (figure 26, main interface for the agent at the call center); at least one icon corresponding to at least one managed application applications (figure 26, icon tabs located at the top of the interface which provide differing workflow applications "service", "activities", "category", etc; as well as figure 4 which shows a search icon to perform a search function; par.71); and a managed application display area the at least one managed application corresponding to the at least one icon (figure 26, activity plans is being shown 2600 from the control "Service-> My Service Request -> Activity Plans), wherein the at least one icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow that guides the agent's handling of a contact (par.82 and figure 26; wherein depicted are various elements in a workflow guideline help an agent handle a customer; "executing workflow and process automation"), and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (par.72-73 and 82).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor

(workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 2, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window (figure 26, in the toolbar; the toolbar as depicted is a separate entity of the graphical user interface).

As for dependent claim 3, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a quick start bar. Subramaniam does not specifically teach wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed application, however Bartz does (figure 4A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 4, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (par.9; figure 19).

As for dependent claim 5, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1. Subramaniam does not in great detail explain how the graphical user interface allows an agent to selectively input data into the at least one managed application displayed in the managed application display area, however Bartz does (col.8, lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 6, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 5. Subramaniam does not in great detail explain more than one managed application is displayed concurrently in the managed application display area , however Bartz does (col.8, lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 7, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein when the agent selects any of the one or more icons, the



corresponding managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display/area (figure 26).

As for independent claim 8, Subramaniam teaches a method of managing a visual space of a customer relations management application, the method comprising:

- a. displaying a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (figure 26, main interface for the agent at the call center);
- b. displaying at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (figure 26); and
- c. displaying an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call, the automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (par.82 and figure 26; wherein depicted are the essential control applications to handle an automated workflow), and wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow (par.72-73 and 82).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the

most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 9, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window (figure 26; various panes are depicted).

As for dependent claim 10, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim. Subramaniam does not in great detail explain further comprising displaying a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed application, however Bartz does (figure 4A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam; this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 11, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising displaying a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (figure 19, 26).

As for dependent claim 12, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selectively inputting data into any one of the least one managed

applications (figure 27).

As for dependent claim 13, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selecting any of the at least one icon thereby displaying the corresponding managed application in the managed application display area (figure 26; note the analysis of claim 7).

As for independent claim 14, Subramaniam teaches in a system having a central processor, a display, a memory and an input device, a graphical user interface for displaying an agent desktop in a contact center, comprising:

- a. a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application;
- b. at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (figure 26, toolbar located at the top of the interface containing various applications "Service", "Activities", etc each part of an automated workflow process containing unique individual forms and information to the agent); and
- c. an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (par.82), and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the

at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step\_ of the automated workflow (par.72-73 and 82).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam; this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result

with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 15, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed outside of the managed application display area (figure 26; note the analysis of claim 9).

As for dependent claim 16, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application (figure 26; note the analysis of claim 10).

As for dependent claim 17, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (figure 25-27).

As for dependent claim 18, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 wherein the graphical user interface is displayed on the agent desktop having a display and an input device (figure 1-2, par.77).

As for dependent claim 19, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 18 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data into any one of the at least one managed applications (par.77, as well commonly known in the art interaction of a user interface makes use of input devices as depicted in figure 2 "user interface" presence).

As for dependent claim 20, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area (figure 26-27; note the analysis of claim 7).

As for independent claim 21, Subramaniam teaches a graphical user interface for displaying on an desktop in a contact center, comprising: a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application (figure 4,26); a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call panel by the current contact to the contact center (fig.26,27 par.9); a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (fig.26); at least one icon corresponding to each one of

the at least one managed applications (fig.26); a managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility & the at least one managed application in the managed application display area (par.72-73); and an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of the current contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control panel (par.82, fig.26 (various application programs par.72)), and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area, further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is selectively displayed outside of the managed display area (fig.26).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected



task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam; this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 22, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 21 wherein the agent desktop has a display and an input device (fig.1-2, par.77).

As for dependent claim 23, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 22 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data into any one of the least one managed applications (par.77; it is well commonly known that

interaction with a user interface has common input device such as mouse and/or keyboard among others (fig.1-2)).

As for dependent claim 24, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area (fig.26; note the analysis of claim 7).

As for dependent claim 25, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23, wherein the type of call is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat (par.8, 9 and 14).

As for independent claim 26, Subramaniam teaches a method for managing a graphical user interface of an agent's desktop in a contact center, the method comprising: receiving a call at the contact center, the call having one of a plurality of media types; automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type; and automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow (par.8, 9, 14, 82 and fig.1-2). Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele;

Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam; this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 27, Subramaniam teaches the method of claim 26.

Subramaniam does not expressly go into detail about wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically re-sizing one or more applications, at least in part, as a function of a number of simultaneously open applications; however Bartz does (col.8, lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam; this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 28, Subramaniam teaches the method of claim 27, wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically closing one or more applications as the agent follows the steps of the pre-programmed call handling workflow (par.8, 15 and 82).

As for dependent claim 29, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 26, wherein the one of the plurality of media types is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat (par.8, 9 and 14).

---

**(10) Response to Argument**

Beginning on page 5 of Appellant's brief (herein after "Brief"), Appellant argues specific issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

A1. For claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 26 Appellant argues that both Subramaniam and Bartz does not disclose "a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow", more specifically "selecting an icon according to a step in an automated workflow". Further the Appellant argues that in addition to the selection of icon that the system is allowing the user to perform automated workflows during a call from a customer in a call center (managing a customer call).

R1. Examiner does not agree, Bartz in detail explains the selection of icons pertaining to an automated workflow wherein the desired icons are graphically displayed according the current step the user is working within. When completion of the step is complete in the automated workflow procedure the graphical user interface is changed/ modified in order to complete the next step in the automated workflow procedure (col.2, lines 59-66; col.3, lines 9-19 and figures 4C-D). In another words Bartz explains an automated workflow that aids the user in performing a desired task selected by the user; wherein during the automatic workflow icons that perform actions are rendered in a order which tasks should be logically performed, therefore only icons which should be acted upon for a certain step in an overall task to be completed is displayed at one

given time during the sequence of steps to be performed relating to the main task to be accomplished. Subramaniam shows the allowing of the user to perform automated workflows during a call from a customer in a call center (managing a customer call) in paragraphs 11, 13-15 and 18. Thus the combination of Bartz into Subramaniam yields a system for an agent in a call center managing customer calls with a graphical user interface which dynamically changes pending on the automated workflow of the call from the customer, therein providing an automated workflow for opening window(s) associated with call center functionality such as to find corresponding information with a current customer the user is working with.

A2. As for claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 26 Appellant further argues for claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 26 that Bartz does not teach "wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area."

R2. Examiner does not agree, Bartz clearly describes how during the automated workflow pertaining to the current step the graphical user interface changes to accommodate what step in the workflow process the user is on, in addition to the workspace which contains a at least one window is modified in such that the placement, visibility and size changes (transition from figure 4C to 4D). (Column 2, lines 43-67; column 4, lines 44-47; column 7, lines 57-67 and column 8, lines 1-48).

A3. As for claims 3, 6, 10, 16 and 21 Appellant further argues that Bartz does not teach a quick start bar that includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications.

R3. Examiner does not agree, as explained on page 10 of the Brief an in the specification a quick start bar that includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications is a list of one or more static icons that remain active to perform or start an application/ process other than the current process the user is currently executing. Bartz shows in figure 4A icons A, B and C which are static icons such that when the user is performing a workflow procedure the user is able to switch from the current workflow and start another non-managed/ non-executing process such as A, B or C (col. 8, lines 49-67; col.9, lines 1-3).

A4. As for claim 4, 11, 17, 21 Appellant argues that Subramaniam does not teach "a contact control panel presenting current contact information".

R4. As explained above in R1, Subramaniam discloses a system which can be used for a call center in which the main portion of the system of Subramaniam is used for looking up client information (par.11-15; 18, 79 and 162).

A5. As for claim 6, Appellant argues that Subramaniam or Bartz does not teach more than one managed applications.

R5. Examiner does not agree, as mentioned above in R3 Bartz teaches three non-managed applications A, B and C the user is able to start an automated workflow

procedure by selecting one of the non-managed applications then upon selection the automated workflow procedure is started thus being managed (managed applications; e.g. user selects B of A,B and C and then A and C as a result are now non-managed applications); (col.2, lines 59-66; col.3, lines 9-19;col. 8, lines 49-67; col.9, lines 1-3).

A6. As for claim 8, Appellant argues that Subramaniam or Bartz does not teach executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a call.

R6. Examiner does not agree, Subramaniam discloses a system which can be used for a call center in which the main portion of the system of Subramaniam is used for looking up client information (par.11-15; 18, 79 and 162; user is able to lookup various related documents for current client) and performing an automated workflow procedure then Bartz is introduced to provide in more detail on how the graphical user interface is visually displayed and changed throughout an automated workflow procedure as explained in R1 above.

A7. As for claim 21, Appellant argues the rejection of claim 21 ignores 37 CFR 1.104(c) (2).

R7. Examiner does not agree, the Examiner has cited the best reference at his command. The Final rejection mailed 06/25/08 provides explanation of the cited references along with citations from references, on pages 13-15 of the Final rejection, to



make a clear understanding about how the immediate invention is the same as the combination of the cited references.

A8. As for claim 26, Appellant argues that Subramaniam or Bartz does not teach handling the call depending at least in part upon the one media type.

R8. Examiner does not agree, Bartz explains an automated workflow that aids the user in performing a desired task selected by the user; the user being able to choose various automated workflow procedures (various media types) (col.2, lines 59-66; col.3, lines 9-19 and figures 4C-D). Subramaniam shows the allowing of the user to perform automated workflows during a call from a customer in a call center (managing a customer call) in paragraphs 11, 13-15 and 18. Thus the combination of Bartz into Subramaniam yields a system for an agent in a call center managing customer calls with a graphical user interface which dynamically changes pending on the automated workflow of the call from the customer, therein providing an automated workflow for opening window(s) associated with call center functionality such as to find corresponding information with a current customer the user is working with.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nicholas Augustine/  
Patent Examiner 2179

February 12, 2009

Conferees:

Ba Huynh

/Ba Huynh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179

R. Ross Viguet #42,203  
2200 Ross Ave, Suite 2300 Dallas TX 75201-2784